

ANNEX B

COORDINATION ANNEX

INTELLIGENCE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE TACTICAL PROFICIENCY TRAINER (IEWTPT)

1. *(These comments were as a result of the 2 April 1997 Draft IEWTPT. They are provided for your information).* The Draft IEWTPT ORD was coordinated with the following agencies:

SUBMITTING AGENCY	COMMENTS RECEIVED	COMMENTS ACCEPTED	COMMENTS REJECTED
<hr/>			
Headquarters, Department of the Army			
DAMO-TR (no response)			
DAMO-FI (no response)			
DAMI-ZXS (no response)			
COMMANDERS			
Forces Command			
AFOP-TS (no response)			
AFOP-FD (no response)			
National Ground Intelligence Center			
IANG-OPS (no response)			
U.S. Forces Korea and Headquarters Eighth Army			
EARM-MA-D-E	0	0	0
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command			
ATDO-I (no response)			
U.S. Army Training Support Center			
ATIC-DMC-CS	30	13	17
U.S. Army Pacific			
APOP-PB (no response)			
APOP-FD (no response)			
U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command			
IAOP-OR-FRT	40	14	26
U.S. Army Reserve Command			
DCSINT (no response)			
U.S. Army Special Operations Command			
AOIN-ISD	3	0	3
U.S. Army Intelligence Center and Fort Huachuca			
ATZS-DCG	5	5	0

SUBMITTING AGENCY	COMMENTS RECEIVED	COMMENTS ACCEPTED	COMMENTS REJECTED
Simulation, Training and Instrumentation Command			
AMSTI-ZP (no response)			
201st MI Brigade (CEWI)	1	0	1
205th MI Brigade (CEWI)	(no response)		
504th MI Brigade (CEWI)	(no response)		
525th MI Brigade (CEWI)	(no response)		
101st MI Battalion	(no response)		
102d MI Battalion	3	1	2
103d MI Battalion	(unable to comment)		
104th MI Battalion	(no response)		
110th MI Battalion	(no response)		
125th MI Battalion	(no response)		
311th MI Battalion	(no response)		
312th MI Battalion	(no response)		
313th MI Battalion	(no response)		
501st MI Battalion	(no response)		
CHIEF			
National Guard Bureau			
NGB-ARO-TS	(no response)		
SENIOR INTELLIGENCE STAFF (G2)			
I CORPS	(no response)		
III CORPS AFZS-GS	6	1	5
V CORPS	(concur as written)		
XVIII (ABN) CORPS	(no response)		
1AD	(no response)		
1CAV	(no response)		
1ID	(no response)		
2ID	(same input as U.S. Forces Korea)		
3ID	(no response)		
4ID (M)	(no response)		
10MTN (L) AFZS-IN-O	0	0	0
25ID	(no response)		
82ID (ABN)	(no response)		
101ST (AASLT)	(no response)		
PROGRAM MANAGERS			
Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar			
SFAE-IEW-JS	(no response)		
Signals Warfare			
SFAE-IEW-SG	(no response)		

SUBMITTING AGENCY	COMMENTS RECEIVED	COMMENTS ACCEPTED	COMMENTS REJECTED
Aerial Common Sensor	(no response)		
Ground Based Common Sensor			
SFAE-IEW-SG	(no response)		
TRAILBLAZER			
AMSEL-LC-IEW-SN	(no response)		
Joint Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle			
SFAE-UAV	0	0	0
Tactical Exploitation System, US Army Space Program Office			
DAMO-FDX	(no response)		
CI/HUMINT Intelligence Management Systems			
SFAE-C3S-INT-CI	(no response)		
PROGRAM EXECUTIVE OFFICE			
Cruse Missile and Joint Unmanned Aerial Vehicles			
PM-TUAV (COL Duckworth)	(no response)		

2. The following comments were not accepted:

Page No.	Para- graph	Recommended Change
1	1a	DELETE: "...at Corps level and below." (IAOP-OR-FRT)
		RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: We will continue to emphasize the need for this tactical trainer at Corps level and below. We understand if some units at EAC own the type equipment that TSAs will be built for then they probably will have them strapped-on or embedded. However, our requirement and emphasis is still the tactical units.
1	1a	CHANGE: Begin a new sentence after "battlefield" with the phase "They will be able to practice...". (IAOP-OR-FRT)
		RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This entire paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
1	1b(1)	<p>CHANGE: “specialties” to “specialists.” (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
1	1b(1)	<p>CHANGE: “STIMULATOR” to “SIMULATOR” to correct misspelling. (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is the correct spelling. We want the TSA to stimulate the IEW collection system not simulate it.</p>
1	1b(2)	<p>ADD: “team” between coordinate and platoon to account for team level CI/HUMINT and SIGINT capabilities that must be trained for and evaluated. (AOIN-ISD)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
1	1b(3)	<p>CHANGE: After “and will” insert a comma followed by “through the TCCs/TSAs.” Reason: Avoid the impression that the WARSIM/WIM will directly stimulate the IEW systems. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
1	1b(3)	<p>REPLACE: “media” with “medium.” (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
1	1b(3)	<p>CHANGE: “STIMULATE” to “SIMULATE” to correct misspelling. (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is the correct spelling. We want the TSA to stimulate the IEW collection system not simulate it.</p>
1	1c	<p>ADD: TSA will not interfere with organic MI intelligence reporting equipment or procedures. (AFZS-GS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This requirement is already listed in paragraph 4c(3).</p>
2	3a(5)	<p>ISSUE: “nor does it train the other MI specialties (IMINT or HUMINT).” MASINT needs to be included as an Army intelligence discipline, even though doctrine and tactics techniques and procedures are still being defined. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: The need for MASINT is now addressed in the rewritten paragraph 1b(1).</p>
2	4a	<p>ADD: “The” before “TSA” and again before “TCC”. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
2	4a	<p>CHANGE TO READ: “digitally replay media” to “digital replay medium” followed by a comma. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
2	4a	<p>COMMENT: If not capable of generation within WARSIM or WIM, the IEW assets listed should be expanded to account for Long Range Surveillance and Special Forces Operational Detachment - A (SFOD-A) unit “salute type” reports. Similar provisions for non-technical inputs provided by Civil Affairs teams and other “operational area players” (PVOs, NGOs and OGAs) in stability or support operations are required to account for full dimensional IEW play as witnessed in typical SOF deployments. (AOIN-ISD)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is a scenario or simulation requirement that is no longer addressed in this ORD.</p>
3	4a(1)	<p>COMMENT: Also what about language? The ORD does not mention a requirement for the TSA to operate in a target language. Without this component you are not providing the necessary realism required to provide a complete training tool that incorporates ALL the skills required by SIGINT, CI and IPW operators. (S3, 102d MI Bn)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: Paragraph 4a(1)(f) does state a language requirement as “...TSA will...provide realistic battlefield environment, to include foreign language input...”.</p>
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>ADD: TSAs for FAST/MITT. Currently III Corps has not fielded the TES. In the interim we are operating with a FAST. If the IEWTPT is fielded prior to fielding the TES, valuable training opportunities would be lost until the TES is fielded to III Corps. If fielding of the IEWTPT is completed after fielding of the TES, then no issue exists. (AFZS-GS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: These are a very low density systems. The cost of developing a TSA to interface with these systems will not equal the limited training value gained.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>ADD: Airborne Reconnaissance Low (ARL) for completeness. (ATIC-DMC-CS, IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is a very low density system. The cost of developing a TSA to interface with this system will not equal the limited training value gained.</p>
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>GENERAL COMMENT: Unless embedded elsewhere, none of the systems cited in the IEWTPT contain a collection management or asset management system. Neither the MI Bde Corps or the Div MI Bn (CEWI) can conduct operations without collection management of some sort. JCMT is the designated tool for Collection Management. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: The TSAs are to stimulate collection systems not collection management tools or systems. As the collection system is tasked to provide intelligence information and reports this information, it will drive the collection management system, if it is being used.</p>
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>ADD: “Army High Frequency Electronic Warfare System (AHFEWS). This system is fielded to the 201st MI BN. Not all of this system can currently be used for training purposes. The IEWTPT would be able to simulate the system and scenarios the system is designed to defeat. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is a very low density system. The cost of developing a TSA to interface with this system will not equal the limited training value gained.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>ADD: Modernized Imagery Exploitation System (MEIS), Enhanced Tactical Radar Corelator (ETRAC), Advanced Electronic Processing and Dissemination System (AEPDS), Joint Collection Management Tool (JCMT), and CHARIOT, S-Band transceiver need to be included in the listing of systems. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: These are a very low density systems. The cost of developing a TSA to interface with this system will not equal the limited training value gained. In addition these are EAC systems that we are not emphasizing at this time.</p>
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>COMMENT: The systems you identify for TSA interface will accommodate all existing and planned IEW systems for this battalion. However, while you incorporate a CI system, there was nothing specifically addressing the IPW portion of the IEW battlefield operating system (BOS) that is especially important here in Korea. Is there a plan for this? (S3, 102d MI Bn)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: The CHATS (AN/PYQ-3(V)) is the only system known at this time that support some limited IPW reporting capability. The comment and questions are beyond the scope of this requirements document.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>ADD: Stimulus for Corps Long Range Surveillance (LRS). Currently, the ORD accounts for Counter Intelligence (CI) via the CI Human Intelligence Automation Tool Set (CHATS) but does not account for LRS/Base Radio Station (BRS) operations. Stimulation for the Corps LRS would add minimal training value to the actual LRS teams, but valuable training could be gained for the BRS operators and agencies that consume intelligence derived from the Corps LRS. (AFZS-GS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: The LRS/BRS operations are not a type of MI specific collection equipment and as such no TSA will be developed. However, this type of data should be considered for the simulation, such as WARSIM 2000, that will help train the Corps battle staff.</p>
3	4a(1)(c)	<p>ADD: TSA/TCC stimulation of Predator TCS. Currently Outrider and Hunter are addressed but Predator is not. At the Corps level, Predator is relied upon to cover gaps in our UAV coverage. As Hunter is phased out of the Army inventor, Predator will play an ever increasing role for Corps collection. Predator is a valuable tool to the Corps MI BOS that should not be overlooked. (AFZS-GS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: Predator is an Air Force collection assets and as such we can not force a requirement on this program since it is not an Army system. However, the requirement to stimulate a Tactical Control Station (TCS) has been added to the ORD in paragraph 4a(1)(c).</p>
3		<p>ADD: "...simulating data from U2R (SIGINT/IMINT) and data from HAE and Predator for completeness." (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is a simulation/scenario requirement that is no longer addressed in this ORD but belongs in the WARSIM 2000 requirement. This will be considered when we define simulation/scenario requirements.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
4	(k)	<p>REWRITE STATEMENT: Needs to be more specific. (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: Statement is clear. The TSA must be within the weight constraints of the IEW asset it is supporting.</p>
4	4a(1)(d)	<p>ISSUE: “When the scenario requires jamming”. This paragraph supports the rationale for why the INSCOM MI Bde (EAC) should be included in the IEWTPT ORD and focus should be changed from a primary Corps and below focus to a Joint Force Land Component Commander and below focus. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: We will continue to emphasize the need for this tactical trainer at Corps level and below. Our requirement and emphasis remains the tactical units.</p>
4	4a(1)(f)	<p>CHANGE: “media” to “medium”. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: The requirement could be for more than one medium so the plural form is correct.</p>
5	4a(3)(a)	<p>CHANGE: “media” to “medium.” (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
5	4a(3)(b)	<p>ISSUE: Doctrinally correct scenarios. Authentic audio and visual signatures. Source of doctrinally correct scenarios and authentic audio and authentic audio and visual signatures. Target signatures which are not audio or visual. MASINT types: UV, IR, seismic, magnetic, and particle. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
5	4a(3)(c)	<p>ISSUE: For geolocation of threat units, threat equipment identification, and status on threat units, in addition to the RF spectrum other parts/aspects of the electromagnetic spectrum must be input to the TPT for IEW system stimulation. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
5	4a(3)(c)	<p>ISSUE: Lines of Bearing (LOB). The natural, physical influences on any system's capability to perform geolocation must be taken into account. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
5	4a(3)(d)	<p>ISSUE: The MI Brigade needs to be able to determine the specific mission AOI and cause them to be inserted into the WARSIM/WIM SG capability within their timelines in support of tactical proficiency training for real-world missions. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
5	4a(3)(e)	<p>REWORD: “context data scenario requirements.” Meaning is unclear. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been deleted and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
5	4a(3)(g)	<p>ADD: “... requirement for transitioning from DIS compliant simulator to a simulator that is High Architecture (HLA) compliant.” (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been eliminated and the comment no longer applies. However, the requirement to use DIS and HLA compliant simulations/ scenarios has been added to the paragraphs 4a(1)(l) and 4a(2)(i) for the TSA and TCC.</p>
5	4b	<p>STATEMENT: Recommend that we reconsider eliminating organizational maintenance. If it will require minimum personnel to repair the items on this system, why is it that our 33T maintenance personnel at unit/organizational level cannot be trained to perform these tasks? Recognize that the operator will be able to perform BIT/BITE; however, the system should be developed to train the organizational maintenance up to depot level. Rationale: The Army recommends use of green suit maintenance where possible. This will also give the organizational maintenance personnel training on repairing the system. (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: An LSA still needs to be performed to accurately determine who, what, where, when and how for maintenance of this training device. The statement that is will be maintained by CLS is based upon our best estimate at this time and the fact that this is a training device and not a TO&E item of equipment.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
6	c(4)	<p>QUESTION: In what vehicle will the TSA and TCC be located? (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is a question that does not require any change to this ORD. However, as stated the TSA is part of the IEW asset be that a TRAILBLAZER or IPF for GUARDRAIL. As for the TCC it is anticipated that the size restriction listed in 4a(2)(f) would allow for the use of HMMWV or similar military vehicle.</p>
7	7a	<p>ADD: <u>All</u> units identified in <u>all</u> items above. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
7	7a	<p>COMMENT: The MTOE units described in item one, reasons should be counted in the active component...”. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
7	7a	<p>ADD: The following number of systems to account for SOF unit specific requirements: 2 x 160th Special Operation Aviation Regiment; 1 x 75th Ranger Regiment; 2 x for each Special Forces Group (total of 14); 2 x US Army Special Operations Command. (AOIN-ISD)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable. Only six TCC will be fielded and the TSAs are by system as identified in paragraph 4a(1)(c) of the ORD.</p>

Page No.	Paragraph	Recommended Change
7	7a	<p>CHANGE: Force structure should include the full suite of the Corps' MI BDE Operations Battalion because they are equipped with the GSM. By only fielding the TCC to the Corps Operations Battalion's training opportunities would be limited. (AFZS-GS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This paragraph has been rewritten and the comment or change is no longer applicable.</p>
Annex A A(1)(c)		<p>ISSUE: All the MI Bde, (EAC) systems should be included. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: We will continue to emphasize the need for this tactical trainer at Corps level and below. In addition these are very low density systems, and as such the cost of developing a TSA to interface with these systems will not equal the limited training value gained.</p>
Annex B		
B-1	1	<p>CHANGE TO READ: "The TSA will support all intelligence disciplines at EAC and ECB to include language, the multitude of intelligence related aspects of the electromagnetic spectrum and training for the individual, system crew/tram, 'MI slice' or TO&E unit." (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: TSAs are fielded by system and if the unit wherever at EAC or ECB has the system then the TSA should support. However, for the very low density systems, such are found at EAC, we still feel that the cost of developing a TSA to interface with these systems will not equal the limited training value gained.</p>

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
B-1	2b	<p>CHANGE TO READ: “While the IEWTPT is in use it will be capable of operating in conjunction with real-world missions and increasingly limiting its participation based on IEW asset operator instruction.” (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: The operator must be either in a training mode or in an operational. To mix the two would possibly confuse the operator and lead to a mission failure.</p>
Annex D		<p>STATEMENT: Needs to be updated. Rationale: Should reflect current-day dollars. (ATIC-DMC-CS)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: Per Army Training Support Center guidance this Annex is no longer required.</p>
Annex E		
E-2 thru E-13		<p>ISSUE: CTLs need to be updated, those required or projected for MASINT added and the classified CTLs provided to reviewers as well as for review. (IAOP-OR-FRT)</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This Annex E is now replaced by Annex C with an updated CTL for individual and collective tasks.</p>
GENERAL QUESTIONS:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Can the IEWTPT Technical Control Cell (TCC) be adapted to support the Intel TAF synthetic simulation generation element? -Can the Technical Control Cell (TCC), Target Signature Array (TSA), and WARSIM/WIM SG be adapted to support the Intel ACE Forward and G2 Operations? -Can the WARSIM/WIM scenario generation capability support a CTC AAR generation requirement? -Does IEWTPT support “realistic” home station training that will prepare S2 personnel for the Brigade/Battalion collective training at a CTC? 		

Page No.	Para- graph	Recommended Change
-------------	----------------	-----------------------

GENERAL QUESTIONS CON'T:

- Can components of IEWTPT be integrated into a CTC-IS Intel TAF to support realistic CTC training to challenge Command, Staff and S2 personnel during Brigade/Battalion force-on-force collective training?
- How are CSTTAR and IEWTPT linked?
- How are FIRESTORM and IEWTPT linked?
(ATIC-DMC-CS)

RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: These are questions that do not require any changes to this ORD. Additionally most can not be rationally answered at this time.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

-Finally, there are a number of “what appear to be” competing Intel programs (FIRESTROM, IEWTPT, WARSIM-WIM, and CSTAR) supported by different proponents (Intel School, BCBL, WSMR, and NTC) with no apparent linkage or coherent integrated training strategy. The Intelligence training system proponent(s) and material developers should clarify how all these programs are to be integrated into the collective training environment. (ATIC-DMC-CS)

RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: Comment can not be addressed in this requirements document. Training strategies are contained in STRAPs, IPTs, and CATS.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION

Add a connectivity to the ORD linking the IEWTPT to the BCTP (WARFIGHTER) Corps Battle Simulation system. (AFZH-MI-S3)

RATIONALE FOR NONACCEPTANCE: This is not an IEWTPT requirement, however using a constructive simulation such as WARSIM links the IEWTPT with the BCTP.

Page No.	Para-graph	Recommended Change
----------	------------	--------------------

STRICOM provided the following comments after review of the latest version of the ORD, as well as, a result of addressing these requirements in the Best Technical Approach. Recommend that any significant changes to the ORD be considered as possible basis for revising the Best Technical Approach and subsequent Program Life Cycle Cost Estimate activities which should occur in the near future. USAIC&FH response is in bold print.

1. Page 1, para 1.a.,line 5 - TIER II training simulates not stimulates the remote video and MTI transmission through the RWS/ASA. It does not stimulate the Tactical Control Station because it has not been delivered yet. It simulates the Control Station-Surrogate Remote Video Transmission (RVT) and the JSTARS MTI display remotely provided by the JSTARS Simulation (JSS). Rationale: Correctness.

(Okay, I agree)

2. Page 1, para 1,a, line 9 - TIER III stimulates actual intelligence system operator stations, not collectors, which in turn, stimulate processors (e.g. RWS,ASAS). Rationale: Correctness **(Okay, I agree)**

3. Page 1, para 1b, line 1, Overview - IEWTPT "replicates", not "establishes". Rationale: Correctness. **(Okay, I agree)**

4. Page 2, para 1b(3), last line - Both the TSA and TCC will be able to use HLA and/or DIS compatible data not simulations/scenarios. Rationale: Correctness.

(Okay, I agree)

5. Page 3, para 2,b, line 2 - Recommend: "Through its component systems, IEWTPT will use the constructive system threat environment."

Rationale: Correctness. **(Okay, I agree)**

6. Page 5, para. 4.a (1)(m) - Replace "simulation/scenarios with "data".

Rationale: Correctness. **(Okay, I agree)**

7. Page 5, para 4.a (1) (o) - Joint Tactical UAV only refers to a specific kind of UAV. Believe the reference should generically address the processing system or Tactical Control Station which will replace the current Control Station-Surrogate in the field.

Rationale: Correctness. **(No. JTUAV is a more general term vs HUNTER or OUTRIDDER. The TCS is addressed but since OUTRIDDER is an ACTD can't predict if it will work.)**

8. Page 5, para 4.a (1) (o) - In previous versions, believe ACS and ARL were switched so the Best Technical Approach consequently addresses them in reverse order. Also should the ARL-Multifunction (ARL-M) be the system version? Need Clarification.

(ARL-M is the more correct term)

Page No.	Para- graph	Recommended Change
-------------	----------------	-----------------------

9. Page 6, para. 4.a (2) (d) - The TCC will synchronize up to 90 TSA. Comment: If there is some operational basis for this number then provide it otherwise the number should be verified as this could be a significant cost driver in the TCC implementation. ***(Yes the operational basis is the fact that the TCC will be deployed at the CORPS. In a "normal" CORPS there at 3 to 5 division assigned plus for MI an MI Brigade at CORPS. At CORPS the MI systems normally are at least one IPF (GRCS), 6 TES, and 6 CGS plus maybe an ARL-M. MI systems per division are 18 CGS, 5 I-REMBASS, one TES, 4 AQF, 6 GBCS(H/L), and unknown number of TCS and CHATS. Therefore 90 TSAs is not unreasonable.)***

10. Page 6, para. 4,a,(2) (g) - Add etc. to the (ie, CD-ROM) rotation. CD-ROM is not the only method and probably not even a preferred method for doing a back-up.

Rationale: Correction (***Okay, I agree***)

11. Page 6, para. 4 a (2) (k) - Typo: Misspelled "larger" (***okay***)

12. Page 6, para 4, a. (2) (l) - Clarification. TCC will have the ability to use existing comms. This statement/requirement must be strengthened to clarify whether TPT will ever have to provide communications networks of its own to net TSAs or connect remotely for CPX, FTX. ***(Can't define at this time. This was to be a follow up study by STRICOM to determine the comms installation by installation.)***

13. Page 7, para 4, a (3) - Change "content" to "context". Rationale: Correctness (***okay***)

14. Page 7, Paragraph 4, b, (7) - The procedures for each level of maintenance and equipment needed to perform the maintenance, to include spares, will be based on Logistics Support Analysis. (***okay***)

15. Page 7, para c (1) - Recommend deleting all reference to AR 380-19-1, DA Pam 25-30 and NSTISSAM TEMPEST 2-95 in paragraph 6c of the ORD. JUSTIFICATION: There is no longer any justification to build equipment to TEMPEST standards, which is what this sentence is attempting to do. In fact, it is pretty much against national policy. AR 380-19-1 is so obsolete that some of what it tells us to do is PROHIBITED by national TEMPEST policy. NSTISSAM TEMPEST 2-95 deals strictly with facilities, not equipment or systems. It would be impossible to build the IEWTPT to those standards. Once the IEWTPT actually exists, it will need to be looked at for TEMPEST only if it meets certain criteria, and then only as part of the equipment in a facility. In other words, the TEMPEST issue will be one of physical security and possible physical separation of equipment within a facility.

15. This comment was worked with our AMC Security POC. ***(I talked with Mr. Dick Hensen the Certified TEMPEST Authority at AMC. He will be at Ft. Huachuca the week of 3 May and will provide a written statement why the TEMPEST requirement may not be necessary.)***

16. Paragraph 5, a, (1) – (3) - The maintenance planning outline in these paragraphs for the TCC and TSA is inconsistent with paragraph 4. b. The TCC and the strap-on TSAs will be supported through Contractor Logistic Support. The embedded TSAs will use the support structure of the host tactical system. The specifics outlined in these paragraphs will be determined through analysis as stated in paragraph 4, b, (7). ***(okay!)***

17. Paragraph 5, e - STRICOM will provide the Contractor Logistic Support for the TCCs and the strap-on TSAs. ***(MD will provide CLS)***

18. Page 9, para 6,a - Comment/clarification: C4I, rather than no special support required, consider the need for C4I comms connectivity to transmit intelligence products to battle commanders and staff in the integrated mode. This is contradictory to para 4,a,2 1. ***(okay)***

19. Page 9, para 7 - Clarification: The Best Technical Approach provided for Ft. Huachuca as the 1st implementation with NTC and Ft. Hood following and the last three after that. The ORD lists NTC and Ft. Hood retrofit before the others and Ft. Huachuca as last, Please clarify order of priority for fielding purposes. ***(The ORD nor the BTA are fielding plans and these “orders of priority” may change depending on future circumstances. Don’t believe they need to be insynch that closely.)***

20. Page 9, para 8 - Clarification. Believe the wording needs to be strengthened to support the Best Technical Approach. Suggest IOC for IEWTPT in FY 00 is required to provide our forces this critical IEW training device. ***(With the current funding profile I believe this is unrealistic!)***

Page No.	Para- graph	Recommended Change
-------------	----------------	-----------------------

GENERAL QUESTIONS FROM TRADOC AND RESPONSE BY USAIC&FH in bold print.

1. Page 2, paragraph 1(2) and (3) describes a closed-loop system for SIGINT and EW reporting of target information to the battlefield commander. However, there is not a system described in this ORD for providing target information directly to the shooter on high-priority targets. Recommend a training feature be included through the use of the TSA and TCC for the IEWTPT. Rationale: Provide complete training capability for the division/corps-level system. ***(The CGS will provide direct firing data to AFATDS and if it is stimulated then it will do this.)***

2. Page 3, paragraph 3c(2), second line: After TROJAN, add Classic. Rationale: TROJAN Classic is the system that provides MI operators and analysts near real-time live environment signals. ***(Okay)***

3. Page 4, paragraph 3c(5), first and second lines: After TROJAN, add Classic. Rationale: Same as above. ***(Okay)***

4. Page 5, paragraph 4a(1)(o), J-STARs: After Common Ground Station, add (CGS). Rationale: Accuracy. ***(CGS is used in para 1,a.)***

5. Page 7, paragraph 4a(3), third line: Delete Army Tactical Command and Control System (ATCCS) and replace with Army Battle Command System (ABCS). Rationale: Army Battle Command System (ABCS) is the correct name. ***(Okay)***

6. Capability to interface with All Source Analysis System (ASAS) to provide a common picture of the battlefield. What is the value-added if MI operators and analysts cannot process, fuse, and disseminate relevant all-source intelligence and targeting support to battle commanders and their staffs. ***(Yes it will if ASAS is in the exercise and these collators are tasked to provide data to ASAS.)***

7. What is required is an overarching training concept of operations (CONOPS). The CONOPS should state that all BOS training devices/ simulators must interface with other BOS training devices to include BCTP, NTC, JRTC, and CMTC training requirements. The CONOPS must coordinate/integrate/exercise the total ground combat power and capabilities. ***(A Training CONOPS was done by STRICOM)***

4. Review of the ORD does not indicate that any of the TRADOC System Managers reviewed/commented on the ORD. This coordinate is essential for the success of the IEWTPT. ***(During worldwide staffing summer 96, it was sent to the system PMs and PEO! And we do have an on going action to keep them informed.)***

5. What capabilities, if any, of a REMBASS/I-REMBASS are reflected in the ORD? ***(It is listed as one of the systems, I-REMBASS that will have a TSA.)***

The following comments are based upon the version 4 IEWTPT ORD being staffed with the Training Device Requirements Review Committee (TDRRC) during May and June 1998 by the Army Training Support Center (ATSC). USAIC&FH response is in bold print.

Page No.	Para- graph	Recommended Change
-------------	----------------	-----------------------

1. From TPIO-SE, paragraph 1.b.(3), state specifically that requirement exits for IEWTPT to link CCTT/SE Core technology and include sensor to shooter links for training/rehearsal/determining courses of action and further link into the family of simulations (FAMSIM). **(We have addressed this requirement in paragraph 4a (2) for which the TCC must interface with the CTC-IS and HITS.)**

2. From C4I Directorate, ODCSCD, HQ TRADOC, paragraph (o) page5, Change Joint Stars subpara to read "... (AN/TSQ-179(V) with UAV Tactical Control Station Level 2 modifications". **(No we won't change. This paragraph already states "... and product improvements to these systems:". This means that the TSA will accommodate the latest version of the system being fielded. Also paragraph 4d, states "Develop IEWTPT with P3I capability. The systems listed in paragraph 4a (1)(o) above will evolve. IEWTPT must also evolve to train all MI specialties and stimulate all tactical collection systems or processors." These two statements we feel should ensure that the latest version will have the IEWTPT.)**

3. From C4I Directorate, ODCSCD, HQ TRADOC, paragraph (o) page5, Add the following Legacy systems: TRAILBLAZER; Enhanced Tactical Radar Correlator; Forward Area Support Terminal; Mobile imagery Tactical Terminal; Modern Imagery Exploitation System; TEAMMATE; QUICKFIX; and TRAFFIC JAM. **(TRAILBLAZER was and will be listed in the ORD. This system is undergoing a technology upgrade and we feel this makes it easier to install the IEWTPT. As for the others, it was a conscious decision not to include these because of replacement system/s (TES/DTES) or they are such old technology (TEAMMATE/QUICKFIS) it would be economically unfeasible to strap on a TSA.)**

4. From ATIC-CTS, page 4, paragraph 4. a. (1), inset after (o): "(p) TSA will interface with a Combat Training Center-Instrumentation System (CTC-IS) and Homestation Instrumentation Training System (HITS) to support live training at a Combat Training Center and the Homestation." **(We will not add this statement because the TSA won't be doing the interfacing. This function must be done by the TCC.)**

Page No.	Para- graph	Recommended Change
-------------	----------------	-----------------------

5. From ATIC-CTS, page 4, paragraph 4. a. (2), inset after (m): "(n) TCC will interface with a Combat Training Center-Instrumentation System (CTC-IS) and Homestation Instrumentation Training System (HITS) to support live training at a Combat Training Center and the Homestation." **(We agree the TCC must interface with the CTC-IS but it will probably be through its database. However we will add a statement to the ORD as paragraph (n) as to the interface requirements for CTC-IS and HITS.)**

6. From STRICOM, page 1, para 1, lines 4, the sentence states the IEWTPT compliments the existing CSTAR. Remove the word "exists" from the sentence, the CSTAR does not exist. **(Disagree. CSTAR was a prototype that was demonstrated at TFXXI and is now a WRAP that is currently under contract and will be fielded in FY99.)**

7. From STRICOM, page 2, para 1, b, (3), lines 10 and 11. The sentence states the TSAs are devices embedded in the equipment. Recommend the strap-on TSAs be included in this paragraph. Paragraph 4, a, (1), (a) and paragraph 5, e, talk about attached and strap-on TSAs. **(Agree will change para 1, b, (3), lines 10 and 11 to add the strapped-on TSAs.)**

8. From STRICOM, page 2, para 1, c, and line 2. Refers to the CSTAR currently in use at the National Training Center. The CSTAR does not exist. **(Disagree. CSTAR was a prototype that was demonstrated at TFXXI and is now a WRAP that is currently under contract and will be fielded in FY99.)**

9. From STRICOM, page 6, para 4, b, (2). Change the sentence to read : "Support of the embedded TSAs will be the responsibility of the host IEW system." **(Agree will change.)**

10. From STRICOM, page 6, para 4a (2) (j). Change (j) to a (k) before para that states "The TCC will provide TSAs with both....." **(Agree will change.)**

11. From STRICOM, page 7, para 5, (2). TSAs are the responsibility of the respective IEW system Program Manager to provide software and hardware maintenance and upgrades. Add the word "hardware" to the sentence. **(Agree will change.)**

12. From STRICOM, page 7, para. 4 c. (1). The requirement for TEMPEST is still questioned. According to AMC Security POC, there is no longer any requirement to build equipment to TEMPEST Standards. What is the reason for the TEMPEST requirement? **(We agree and have removed this statement from this paragraph. However, per the AMC Certified TEMPEST Technical Authority there is a requirement to test for "...inspectable space requirements.", this type statement which was provided to us is now paragraph 6a, (2) of version 4.1 of the IEWTPT ORD.)**

13. From STRICOM, page 7, para 5, b. The paragraph should address whether or not there is any required equipment necessary to support the maintenance of the IEWTPT hardware and software. **(Agree, but we do not have the logistic support analysis to make that determination at this time.)**

14. From STRICOM, page 8, paragraph 8. The POM submission for OMA funds to support a FY00 Initial Operational Capability has already passed, the available OMA funds cannot support a FY00 fielding. **(Agree, we have changed IOC until FY03.)**

15. From STRICOM, page 9, para 7. Change the fielding profile to the TCCs to match the current strategy: Field Ft. Huachuca, NTC, Ft. Hood and then JRTC. **(Agree will change.)**